

REMARKS

The Official Action of May 10, 2007, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 12-18, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 11 have been cancelled and new claims 12-18 added. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 12-18 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and objection to the drawings, Application has amended the claims and the drawings to eliminate each of the problems identified by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and the objections to the drawings has now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 11, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Myers '591 and claims 3, 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers in view of Edwards '382. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as applied to new independent claims 12 and 13 and claims dependent therefrom.

With regard to new independent claim 12, Applicant notes that it is a combination of the features in canceled independent claim 1 and dependent claims 9 and 11 wherein the language of claim 9 was redrafted to overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. Applicant further notes that the rejection of claim 9 was rejected only on the basis of 35 U.S.C. §112 with no prior art cited against the claim. Accordingly, Applicant having overcome the 35 U.S.C. rejection of claim 9, respectfully submits that independent claim 12 and dependent claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 are allowable on the basis of the inclusion of the claim 9 features in claim 12.

As noted above, Applicant has further traversed the prior art rejection as applied to new claim 13 and claims 14-18 dependent therefrom.

Applicant respectfully submits that Myers clearly does not teach a tube and a part which are each arced along their lengths in a manner which permits the part to be engaged within the tube, wherein the first portion of the part has a section which is expandable to form a tight fit with respect to the tube.

While Edwards may be cited as showing an arced tube and part, both it and Meyers fail to teach a first portion of the part having a section which is expandable to form a tight fit with regard to the tube. Contrary to the Examiner's

positions there is nothing in Meyers which teach the claimed expandable section, or the two opposing ends of new claim 18.


Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention patentably defines over the cited prior art on the basis of the structural differences identified above.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma:nlw
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\O\Okpa\SCHAAP1\pto\2007-08-10 Amendment.doc